

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Jeffries, Wolcott, Wolcott & Lankford and Floyd M. Hughes, for plaintiff in error.

Loyall, Taylor & White, Thos. H. Willcox, and A. G. Burrow, for defendant in error.

BONSAL v. CAMP.

Jan. 12, 1911.

[69 S. E. 978.]

1. Cancellation of Instruments (§ 23*)—Rescission—Restoration of Former Status.—In an action to annul a contract, there must be a sufficient averment and proof of facts to justify the interposition of the court, which must be able to substantially restore the parties to the position which they occupied before they entered into the contract.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see Cancellation of Instruments, Cent. Dig. § 32; Dec. Dig. § 23.* 11 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 887, 894.]

2. Cancellation of Instruments (§ 35*)—Parties.—On a bill to rescind a contract, all those substantially interested in the contract should be parties, unless the interests are severable, and, if the case can be completely decided as between the parties, that an interest exists in another whom the court can not reach by process will not prevent a decree.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see Cancellation of Instruments, Cent. Dig. §§ 55-65; Dec. Dig. § 35.* 11 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 902.]

3. Cancellation of Instruments (§ 35*)—Parties.—In an action to rescind a deed by defendant on the ground that plaintiff was induced to make the purchase through the fraudulent representations of one C., who assumed to act as plaintiff's agent and who was to be interested to the extent of one-twentieth of the land, the purchase price whereof was \$40,000, but who was alleged to be acting in defendant vendor's interest, such C. was a necessary party.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see Cancellation of Instruments, Cent. Dig. §§ 55-65; Dec. Dig. § 35.* 11 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 902.]

Appeal to Circuit Court of City of Norfolk.

Bill by W. N. Camp against W. R. Bonsal. Decree for plaintiff, and defendant appeals. Reversed and remanded.

Thos. H. Willcox and N. T. Green, for appellant.

W. L. Williams and Peatross & Savage, for appellee.

^{*}For other cases see same topic and section NUMBER in Dec. Dig. & Am. Dig. Key No. Series & Rep'r Indexes.